

REMARKS

Advisory Action

The Advisory Action of April 29, 2011 has been received and reviewed. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner alleges that:

Shaubach et al. discloses that the vapor removal channel 38 encompasses/overlaps the wick 40 (because the wick is both located within the vapor removal channel 38 AND its porosity allows vapor to be moved/removed therethrough); hence, the vapor removal channel 38 extends to the interface between the wick 40 and the housing of the heat pipe 28 . . . Shaubach et al. discloses the liquid flow channel or artery structure 34 as encompassing/overlapping the corresponding portion of the wick 40 and extending to the corresponding liquid barrier wall of artery 32 as shown in Figure 4; the liquid flow channel or artery structure 34 of Shaubach et al. thus is located at the interface of the corresponding portions of the wick 40 and of the liquid barrier wall of the artery 32 . . .

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's duty to give the claims the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art. M.P.E.P. § 2111. Applicants assert, however, that the Examiner's apparent interpretation of "a vapor removal channel located at an interface between the primary wick and the heated wall" and "a liquid flow channel located at an interface between the liquid barrier wall and the primary wick" is not consistent with the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art. It appears that the Examiner is depending on porosity of the wick to maintain the Examiner's the rejections. Applicants note that this interpretation of Shaubach has not been previously asserted before the instant Advisory Action. However, Applicants respectfully assert that it appears that, under such an interpretation, any vapor or liquid path formed by the inherent porosity of the wick would be located within the wick and would not be considered a channel *located at an interface* between a primary wick and one of the heated wall and a liquid barrier wall. Moreover, it is noted that there appears to be no disclosure in Shaubach that the wick would form a liquid or vapor channel at an interface of a wall against which it is disposed.

Nonetheless, in order to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 52 to further distinguish the claims from the references of record as discussed in further detail below.

Amendments to the Claims

The Final Office Action dated February 18, 2011 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 3, 6 through 12, 16, 18 through 47, 49 through 54, 57, 59, 60, 63 through 65, and 79 through 85 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 through 3, 6 through 12, 16, 18, 24 through 28, 52 through 54, 57, 59, 60, 64, and 65 are currently under examination. Claims 19 through 23, 29 through 47, 49 through 51, 63, and 79 through 85 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1 through 3, 6 through 12, 16, 18, 24 through 28, 52 through 54, 57, 59, 60, 64, and 65 stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 9 through 12, 29, 52, 59, 64, and 79. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application as presented herein.

The amendments to claims 10 and 11 improve clarity and form. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 29, 52, 59, 64, and 79 may be found at least in paragraphs [0135] through [0139] and FIGS. 12A and 12B of the as-published specification.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No.4,854,379 to Shaubach et al.

Claims 1, 6 through 12, 16, 26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,854,379 to Shaubach et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Shaubach”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Unless a single prior art reference describes “all of the limitations claimed” **and** “all of the limitations [are] **arranged or combined in the same way** as recited in the claim, it cannot be said to prove prior invention of the thing claimed and, thus, cannot anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102.” *Net MoneyIN Inc. v. VeriSign Inc.*, 545 F.3d 1359, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2008). A single prior

art reference must “clearly and unequivocally” describe the claimed invention “without any need for picking, choosing, and combining various disclosures not directly related to each other by the teachings of the cited reference.” *Id.* (*citing In re Arkley*, 455 F.2d 586, 587 (C.C.P.A. 1972)).

Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) anticipation rejections of claims 1, 6 through 12, 16, 26, and 28 are improper at least because Shaubach does not inherently or expressly describe each and every element independent claim 1.

Shaubach describes a heat pipe 28 configured to isolate an external artery structure 34 from effect by heat sources 36. *Shaubach*, col. 4, lines 39-55. A wick 40 covers the inside surface of heat pipe 28 and encloses vapor space 38. *Id.* An opening 30 in artery 32 is positioned on the side most remote from the heat source 36 and functions to supply liquid to the wick 40. *Id.*

Applicants again assert that Shaubach does not describe a vapor removal channel located at an interface between the wick and a heated wall (*i.e.*, a surface forming a common boundary between the wick and a wall) and a liquid flow channel located at an interface between a liquid barrier wall and the wick (*i.e.*, a surface forming a common boundary between the wick and a wall).

In the most recent Office Action, the Examiner appears to assert that a liquid barrier wall or a heated wall may allegedly be any wall in Shaubach that may be utilized for such a purpose. However, regardless of the intended use/operation of the walls in Shaubach, there appears to be no structure (*e.g.*, walls) in Shaubach having a vapor removal channel located at an interface between the wick and the wall or a liquid flow channel located at an interface between the wall and the wick. Specifically, Shaubach does *not* describe an evaporator for a heat transfer system comprising “a vapor removal channel *located at an interface between the primary wick and the heated wall*,” as recited in independent claim 1. As shown in FIG. 4 of Shaubach, the vapor space 38 is not located at an interface between the wick 40 and the housing of the heat pipe 28, but rather, is encompassed by the wick 40, which is in turn encompassed by the housing of the heat pipe 28.

Furthermore, Shaubach does *not* describe an evaporator for a heat transfer system comprising “a liquid flow channel *located at an interface between the liquid barrier wall and*

the primary wick,” as recited in independent claim 1. As also shown in FIG. 4, the artery 32 does not include a liquid flow channel located at an interface between the artery 32 and the wick 12. Rather, the liquid flow channel in the external artery structure 34 (*i.e.*, opening 30 in the artery 32) is disposed within the wick 12 and not at an interface between the outer wall forming the artery 32 and the wick 12.

Finally, as discussed above, independent claim 1 has been further amended to recite “a vapor removal channel located at an interface between the primary wick and the heated wall and *formed in at least one of an inner surface of the heated wall and an outer surface of the primary wick*” and “a liquid flow channel located at an interface between the liquid barrier wall and the primary wick and *formed in at least one of an inner surface of the liquid barrier wall and the outer surface of the primary wick.*” As shown in FIG. 4, Shaubach does not describe a vapor removal channel or a liquid flow channel located formed in a wall of the heat pipe. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner is relying on the inherent porosity of the wick, any path for fluid or liquid in the wick would be formed within the wick and not in an outer surface of the wick.

Thus, for at least the reasons set forth above, Shaubach does not expressly or inherently describe a structure describing every element set forth in claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Shaubach and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Applicants additionally assert that each of claims 6 through 12, 16, 26, and 28 depends directly or indirectly from claim 1, and thus includes all of the elements thereof. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 6 through 12, 16, 26, and 28 are allowable, *inter alia*, as depending from allowable claim 1.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Applicants additionally assert that Shaubach does not expressly or inherently describe an evaporator for a heat transfer system “wherein the vapor removal channel is *formed in the inner surface the heated wall,*” as recited in dependent claim 6, as currently proposed to be amended. As shown in FIG. 4 of Shaubach, the vapor space 38 is *not* formed in an inner surface of the housing of the heat pipe 28. Rather, the vapor space 38 is separated from the housing of the heat pipe 28 by the wick 40. Thus, Shaubach does not

expressly or inherently describe a structure describing every element set forth in the claim. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for this additional reason.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Applicants additionally assert that Shaubach does not describe an evaporator for a heat transfer system “wherein a first portion of the vapor removal channel is *formed in the inner surface of the heated wall* and second portion of the vapor removal channel is *formed in the outer surface of the primary wick*,” as recited in dependent claim 9, as currently proposed to be amended. As shown in FIG. 4 of Shaubach, *no portion* of the vapor space 38 is formed in an inner surface of the heated wall, nor is any portion of the vapor space 38 formed in an outer surface of the wick 40. Rather, the vapor space 38 is merely positioned adjacent an inner surface of the wick 40. Thus, Shaubach does not expressly or inherently describe a structure describing every element set forth in the claim. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for this additional reason.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Applicants additionally assert that Shaubach does not describe an evaporator for a heat transfer system, “wherein the vapor removal channel is *formed in the outer surface of the primary wick*,” as recited in dependent claim 12, as currently proposed to be amended. Again, as shown in FIG. 4 of Shaubach, *no portion* the vapor space 38 is formed an outer surface of the wick 40. Rather, the vapor space 38 is merely positioned adjacent an inner surface of the wick 40. Thus, Shaubach does not expressly or inherently describe a structure describing every element set forth in the claim. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for this additional reason.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 4,854,379 to Shaubach et al.

Claims 2, 3, 18, 24, 25, 52 through 54, 57, 59, 60, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaubach. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference itself (or references when combined) or “the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would [have] employ[ed]” at the time of the invention must teach or suggest all of the claim elements. *K.S.R. Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 418, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007); *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Additionally, the Examiner must determine whether there is “an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue.” *Id.* “[A] patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art.” *Id.* Further, rejections on obviousness grounds “cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *Id.* (*quoting In re Kahn*, 441, F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)). Finally, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Furthermore, the reason that would have prompted the combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself, and not based on the Applicant’s disclosure. *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C. H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2006); M.P.E.P. § 2144. Underlying the obvious determination is the fact that hindsight cannot be used. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at 421; *DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1367.

Claims 2, 3, 18, 24, and 25

A *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot be established against any of claims 2, 3, 18, 24, and 25 because Shaubach, or the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have employed at the time of the invention, do not teach or suggest the elements of independent claim 1.

As discussed above, Shaubach does not describe each and every claim limitation of claim 1. Applicants further assert that, for the same reasons discussed above, Shaubach does not teach or suggest, “a vapor removal channel located at an interface between the primary wick and the heated wall and *formed in at least one of an inner surface of the heated wall and an outer surface of the primary wick*” and “a liquid flow channel located at an interface between the

liquid barrier wall and the primary wick and *formed in at least one of an inner surface of the liquid barrier wall and the outer surface of the primary wick*," as recited in claim 1, as currently amended. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Shaubach to modify the structure taught therein to include the limitations of claim 1.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner generally asserts that, "mere reversal of parts, duplication of parts, and rearrangement of parts relate to obvious design choice and have no patentable significance unless either critically and/or new and unexpected results are produced. See *In re Gazda*, 219 F.2d 449, 104 USPQD 400 (CCPA 1955), *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960), and *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). In this instance, applicant has failed to make a showing of either criticality or unexpected results." *Office Action*, p. 2-3.

It is noted that it appears that in making the allegation that the Applicants have failed to make a showing of criticality or unexpected results, that the Examiner is improperly attempting to place a burden on Applicants to establish (such as by making assertions as to the criticality of certain claim elements) patentability of the claims. It is well established, however, that the burden is on the Examiner to make a *prima facie* case that the claims are not patentable.

Applicants note, moreover, that the lack of such description by Applicants is simply inadequate to serve as a foundation for a conclusion of obviousness. Applying the rationale advanced by the Examiner, an applicant could inoculate claims from a charge of obviousness merely by including self-serving statements of the criticality of particular limitations in the application. Such an approach however has no basis in logic or fact.

It is further noted that while the Examiner has relied on various legal precedent as supporting the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner has failed to demonstrate any similarity between the facts of such legal precedent and the facts in the present case. As the M.P.E.P. makes clear, "legal precedent can provide the rationale supporting obviousness *only* if the facts in the case are similar to those in the application." M.P.E.P. § 2144 (emphasis added). Inasmuch as the Examiner has failed to perform the required comparison and the Examiner has failed to establish that the facts in the cited case are similar to those in the application, the rejection lacks an adequate foundation and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicants identify that the cases cited by the Examiner appear to be factually distinct and inapplicable to the instant application. For example, the court of *In re Japikse* found that “[c]laims to a hydraulic power press which read on the prior art except with regard to the position of the starting switch were held unpatentable because shifting the position of the starting switch would not have modified the operation of the device.” *See M.P.E.P.* §2144.04(VI)(C). However, it appears that modification of Shaubach to form, for example, an evaporator “wherein the heated wall is disposed inside the primary wick, which is disposed inside the liquid barrier wall,” as recited in claim 25, would *significantly modify* the operation of the heat pipe 28. As shown in FIG. 4 and described by Shaubach, the heat pipe 28 is configured to receive heat from heat sources 36 on the outside of the heat pipe 28. Modifying the heat pipe 28 with a mere rearrangement or reversal of the parts as suggested by the Examiner (assuming such an alteration was even feasible, which Applicants assert that it is not) would appear to result in a heat pipe 28 that would be required to receive heat from within the heat pipe 28, thereby, significantly modifying the operation of the heat pipe 28.

Moreover, the heat pipe 28 appears to require the above structural configuration as vapor generated at the inner surface of the housing must travel inward, through the wick 40, to enter the vapor space 38 and exit the heat pipe 28. To that end, switching the position of the wall configured to receive heat from the heat sources 36 would modify the flow pattern of the vapor generated at the inner surface of the housing such that it would not require traveling through the wick 40 to exit the heat pipe 28. Accordingly, rearrangement or reversal of the parts of the heat pipe 28 to accord with the evaporator recited in claim 1 would appear to modify the operation of the heat pipe 28 and would not be a mere rearrangement or reversal of parts.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants assert that the evaporator for a heat system of claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based on the teachings or suggestions of Shaubach. Consequently, the nonobviousness of independent claim 1 precludes a rejection of claims 2, 3, 18, 24, and 25 which depend therefrom because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. *See In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), see also M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.* Therefore, the Applicants

request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejection of claims 2, 3, 18, 24, and 25.

Regarding each of dependent claims 2 and 18, Applicants additionally submit that Shaubach does not describe the evaporator for a heat transfer system of claim 1, “further comprising additional vapor removal channels *located at the interface between the primary wick and the heated wall*,” as recited in each of dependant claims 2 and 18. Applicants note the Examiner’s assertion, “absent a showing a criticality and/or unexpected results, duplication of parts (i.e., channels) does not impart patentability.” *Office Action*, p.4. In response, Applicants respectfully assert that the evaporator recited in claims 2 and 18 would not be formed by a mere duplication of the vapor space 38 taught in Shaubach. As discussed above, the vapor space 38 is not located at the interface between the wick 40 and the housing of the heat pipe 28, but rather, is encompassed by the wick 40 (which in turn is encompassed by the housing of the heat pipe 28). Accordingly, somehow duplicating the vapor space 38 taught by Shaubach, would still not teach or suggest the evaporator recited in claims 2 and 18. Therefore, Applicants assert that each of dependent claims 2 and 18 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made considering Shaubach, and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each of dependent claims 2 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for this additional reason.

Claims 52 through 54, 57, 59, 60, and 64

A *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot be established against any of claims 52 through 54, 57, 59, 60, and 64 because Shaubach, or the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have employed at the time of the invention, do not teach or suggest the elements of claim 52.

For substantially the same reasons discussed above in relation to independent claim 1, it is submitted that Shaubach also does not teach or suggest an evaporator for a heat transfer system comprising “a vapor removal channel located at an interface between the primary wick and the heated wall” and “a liquid flow channel located at an interface between the liquid barrier wall and the primary wick,” as recited in independent claim 52.

Furthermore, as also discussed above, independent claim 52 has been further amended to recite “a primary wick extending from a portion of the heated wall to a portion of the liquid barrier wall and being coaxial with the heated wall, ***wherein the heated wall is positioned within a portion of both the liquid barrier wall and the primary wick.***” As shown in FIG. 4, Shaubach does not describe that a heated wall having a heat-absorbing surface adjacent to a heat source is positioned within a portion of both a liquid barrier wall and a wick. Furthermore, for substantially the same reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1, there appears to be no teaching or suggestion in Shaubach to modify the heat pipe taught therein to include such elements or such a configuration.

Accordingly, at least for the reasons set forth above, Applicant asserts that independent claim 52 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made considering the Shaubach, and requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Moreover, the nonobviousness of independent claim 52 precludes a rejection of claims 53, 54, 57, 59, 60, and 64 which depend therefrom because a dependent claim is obvious only if the independent claim from which it depends is obvious. *See In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Therefore, the Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) obviousness rejection to independent claim 52 and claims 53, 54, 57, 59, 60, and 64 which depend therefrom.

Regarding dependent claim 59, for substantially the same reasons presented above in relation to claims 1 and 6, Applicants additionally submit that Shaubach does not teach or suggest an evaporator for a heat transfer system, “wherein the vapor removal channel is ***formed in an inner surface the heated wall,***” as recited in dependent claim 59, as currently proposed to be amended. Therefore, Applicants assert that dependent claim 59 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made considering Shaubach, and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for this additional reason.

Regarding dependent claim 60, for substantially the same reasons presented above in relation to claims 1 and 9, Applicants additionally submit that Shaubach does not teach or

suggest an evaporator for a heat transfer system, “wherein the vapor removal channel is *formed in a portion of the primary wick and a portion of the heated wall*,” as recited in dependent claim 60. Therefore, Applicants assert that dependent claim 59 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made considering Shaubach, and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for this additional reason.

Regarding dependent claim 64, for substantially the same reasons presented above in relation to claims 1 and 12, Applicants additionally submit that Shaubach does not teach or suggest an evaporator for a heat transfer system, “wherein the vapor removal channel is *formed in an outer surface of the primary wick*,” as recited in dependent claim 64, as currently proposed to be amended. Therefore, Applicants assert that dependent claim 64 would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made considering Shaubach, and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for this additional reason.

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 4,854,379 to Shaubach et al., in View of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0062648 to Ghoshal

Claims 27 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaubach, in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0062648 to Ghoshal (hereinafter referred to as “Ghoshal”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Claims 27 and 65 depend from one of independent claim 1 or independent claim 52 and include each of the elements recited therein. As discussed above, Shaubach does not describe, teach, or suggest each and every element of claim 1 or claim 52.

Ghoshal teaches an apparatus for dense chip packaging using heat pipes and thermoelectric coolers. *Ghoshal*, Abstract. However, Ghoshal does not appear to remedy the many deficiencies of Shaubach discussed hereinabove.

Therefore, claims 27 and 65 are not obvious at least because independent claim 1 and independent claim 52, from which claims 27 and 65 respectively depend, are not obvious. *See In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Withdrawn Claims/Rejoinder

As previously noted, claims 19 through 23 are withdrawn from consideration as directed to a nonelected invention. However, Applicants note that claims 19 through 23 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 19 through 23 should be rejoined and allowed in conjunction with the allowance of claim 1.

Further, claim 63 is withdrawn from consideration as directed to a nonelected invention. However, Applicants note that claim 63 depends from claim 52. Therefore, claim 63 should be rejoined and allowed in conjunction with the allowance of claim 52.

Finally, claims 30 through 47, 49 through 51, and 79 through 85 are withdrawn from consideration as directed to a nonelected invention. However, Applicants note that independent claim 29, as currently amended, and claims 30 through 47 and 49 through 51 depending therefrom, require all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 29, and claims 30 through 47, and 49 through 51, depending therefrom, should be rejoined and allowed in conjunction with the allowance of claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants note that independent claim 79, as currently amended, and claims 80 through 85 depending therefrom, require all the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 79, and claims 80 through 85, depending therefrom, should be rejoined and allowed in conjunction with the allowance of claim 1.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The amendments to claims 1, 6, 9 through 12, 29, 52, 59, 64, and 79 above are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1 through 3, 6 through 12, 16, 18 through 47, 49 through 54, 57, 59, 60, 63 through 65, and 79 through 85 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory C. Baker
Registration No. 61,335
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: May 18, 2011
GCB/nj:lhs